

## REMARKS

The following is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated December 20, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on March 20, 2008. Claims 3-22 were examined. Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 3, 4, and 7-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Robotham (U.S. 6,775,293) in view of Natanson (U.S. 6,611,525). Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Robotham and Natanson in further view of Spinney (U.S. 6,426,943). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Robotham and Natanson in further view of Wei (U.S. 6,560,196).

In response, claims 3-17 are amended, claims 18-22 are canceled, and new claims 23-27 are added.

### Rejections under §101

Claims 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Per the Examiner's suggestion, paragraph [00150] of the present application is being amended to remove the reference to "information conveyed to a computer by a communication medium" from the definition of a "computer readable medium." Applicants submit that the change sufficiently addresses the Examiner's concern and, therefore, request that the §101 rejections of the claims be withdrawn.

### Rejections under §103(a)

Claim 3 is amended to recite the limitations of receiving a first packet fragment associated with a first packet, determining that the first packet fragment has a valid checksum, and storing the first packet fragment in a reserved buffer space in memory corresponding to the first packet. Also, claim 3 is amended to recite the further limitations of starting a timer to measure a time period, sorting the packet fragments in the reserved buffer space based on a fragment number associated with each packet fragment, and determining whether any packet fragment associated with the first packet is missing. Support for these amendments may be found at Figures 16-17 and paragraphs [00154] to [00162] of the present application.

None of the cited references teaches or suggests preparing a plurality of packet fragments to be assembled into a single packet, as recited in amended claim 3. In fact, none of the cited references discloses a technique of handling the case of packet fragments. The background section of the present application describes the problem with conventional systems, namely that packet “fragments are summarily processed by dropping them” (paragraph [0013]), which causes data loss. In contrast, amended claim 3 recites limitations that assemble packet fragments into a packet to solve the problem discussed in the background section of the present application. The cited references teach nothing more than the systems and methods discussed in the background of the present application. For these reasons, amended claim 3 is patentable over the cited references.


Additionally, claims 4 and 5 are amended to recite limitations that depend on whether fragments are missing at the end of the time period. More specifically, amended claim 4 recites the limitations of clearing the reserved buffer space when at least one packet fragment is missing at the end of the time period. As described at paragraphs [00154] to [00162] of the present application, clearing the reserved buffer space may be advantageous in limited-memory systems. As set forth above, none of the cited references teaches or suggests handling the case of packet fragments, let alone clearing a buffer if at least one packet fragment is missing at the end of the time period, as recited in amended claim 4. For these reasons, these claims are patentable over the cited references.

As the foregoing illustrates, the cited references each fail to teach or suggest the limitations of amended claim 3 that relate to packet fragments. Therefore, no combination of the cited references can render claim 3 obvious. For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 is patentable over the cited references and requests allowance of the claim. Independent claims 11 and 23 recite limitations similar to those of claim 3. Therefore, these claims are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as claim 3. Claims 4-10, 12-17, and 24-27, depend, respectively, from allowable claims 3, 11, and 23 and are therefore also in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the above remarks, Applicants believe that they have overcome all of the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action mailed on December 20, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on March 20, 2008, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, please contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

John C. Carey  
Registration No. 51,530  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicants